arXiv:1211.3356v1 [math.CA] 14 Nov 2012

# ON SHAPIRO'S THEOREM FOR $F$-SPACES AND SOME APPLICATIONS

J. M. ALMIRA

Abstract. In their previous papers [3], [4], Almira and Oikhberg investigated the existence of an element $x$ of a quasi-Banach space $X$ whose errors of best approximation by a given approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ (defined by $E(x, A_n) = \inf_{a \in A_n} \|x - a_n\|$) decay arbitrarily slowly. In this paper, we consider the same question for $F$-spaces $(X, d)$ with non decreasing metric $d$ and we give some applications to the study of slow convergence of sequences of operators.

## 1. Motivation

A famous theorem by Kakutani [15] claims that a topological vector space is metrizable if and only if it contains a countable basis of neighborhoods. Furthermore, if the topological vector space $X$ admits a compatible metric $d$ then it also admits an equivalent metric $d^*$ which is translation invariant. Thus, we assume in all what follows that our metrics are translation invariant. Recall that a metric vector space $(X, d)$ is named an $F$-space if and only if it is complete (i.e., if Cauchy sequences are convergent sequences). There are two large categories in these spaces: the locally bounded and the locally convex ones. An important result by Aoki [5] and Rolewicz [22] guarantees that every locally bounded metric vector space admits a compatible $p$-norm, so that the class of locally bounded $F$-spaces coincides with the class of quasi-Banach spaces. On the other hand, it is also well known that normable metric spaces are precisely the metric vector spaces which are locally bounded and locally convex (this result was proved by Kolmogorov in 1935 [18]). In particular, an $F$-space is Banach if and only if it is locally bounded and locally convex.

Given $(X, d)$ an $F$-space, and $A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \ldots \subset A_n \subset \ldots \subset X$ an infinite chain of subsets of $X$, where all inclusions are strict, we say that $(X, \{A_n\})$ is an *approximation scheme* (or that $(A_n)$ is an approximation scheme in $X$) if:

- $(A1)$ There exists a map $K : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $K(n) \geq n$ and $A_n + A_n \subseteq A_{K(n)}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $(A2)$ $\lambda A_n \subset A_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all scalars $\lambda$.
- $(A3)$ $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$ is a dense subset of $X$

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 41A29, 41A25, 41A65, 41A27.

*Key words and phrases.* Approximation scheme, approximation error, approximation with restrictions, Bernstein's Lethargy Theorem, Shapiro's Theorem, Metric vector space, $F$-space.

Approximation schemes were introduced in Banach space theory by Butzer and Scherer in 1968 [9] and, independently, by Y. Brudnyi and N. Kruglyak under the name of "approximation families" in 1978 [8], and popularized by Pietsch in his seminal paper of 1981 [19], where the approximation spaces $A_p^r(X,A_n)=\{x\in X:\|x\|_{A_p^r}=\|\{E(x,A_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}\|_{\ell_{p,r}}<\infty\}$ were studied. Here,

$$\ell_{p,r}=\{\{a_n\}\in\ell_\infty:\|\{a_n\}\|_{p,r}=\left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}n^{rp-1}(a_n^*)^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}<\infty\}$$

denotes the so called Lorentz sequence space, $(X,\|\cdot\|_X)$ is a quasi-Banach space and $E(x,A_n)=\inf_{a\in A_n}\|x-a\|_X$.

A fundamental part of the theory developed by the authors of the above mentioned papers consists of the study of the embeddings between the involved spaces. Concretely, Pietsch proved that the embedding $A_p^r(X,A_n)\hookrightarrow A_q^s(X,A_n)$ holds true whenever $r>s>0$ or $r=s$ and $p<q$. This, in conjunction with the central theorems in approximation theory, which state a strong relation between smoothness of functions $f$ (compactness of operators $T$, respectively) and fast decay of approximation errors $E(f,A_n)$ (approximation numbers $a_n(T)$, respectively), has been used to speak about the scale of smoothness (compactness, respectively) defined by an approximation scheme $(X,\{A_n\})$. Concretely, it is assumed (see, for example, [2], [13], [14], [20]) that membership to the approximation space $A_p^r(X,\{A_n\})$ is a concept of smoothness (compactness if $X=B(Y_1,Y_2)$ and $A_n=\{T\in B(Y_1,Y_2):\mathbf{rank}(T)<n\}$). Approximation schemes are, thus, a natural object to study in Approximation Theory. Indeed, the approximation scheme concept is the abstract tool that models all approximation processes, and can be considered as a central concept for the theory. In this paper, we study the behavior of best approximation errors of an element $x\in X$ relative to an approximation scheme when $(X,d)$ is an $F$-space.

To proceed further, we fix some notation. We write $\{\varepsilon_i\}\searrow 0$ to indicate that the sequence $\varepsilon_1\geq\varepsilon_2\geq\ldots\geq 0$ satisfies $\lim_i\varepsilon_i=0$. For an $F$-space $(X,d)$, we denote by $B_d(x,r)$ and $S_d(x,r)$ the closed ball and the sphere of center $x\in X$ and radius $r>0$, respectively. That is, $S_d(x,r)=\{y\in X:d(x,y)=r\}$, and $B_d(x,r)=\{y\in X:d(x,y)\leq r\}$. We use the notation $B(x,r)$ and $S(x,r)$ if there is no possibility of confusion with respect to the metric $d$ we are dealing with. If $x\in X$, and $A\subset X$, we define the *best approximation error* of $x$ with respect to $A$ by $E(x,A)_X=dist(x,A)_X=\inf_{a\in A}d(x,a)$. When there is no confusion as to the ambient space $X$, we simply use the notation $E(x,A)$. If $B$ and $A$ are two subsets of $X$ and $\lambda$ is an scalar, we set $A+B=\{x+y:x\in A\text{ and }y\in B\}$, $\lambda A=\{\lambda x:x\in A\}$, and $E(B,A)=\sup_{b\in B}E(b,A)$ (note that $E(B,A)$ may be different from $E(A,B)$). Finally, we recall that $A\subset X$ is bounded if for every $r>0$ there exists $\lambda>0$ such that $A\subseteq\lambda B(0,r)$ (this is quite different of being $d$-bounded, which means that $A\subseteq B(0,r)$ for a certain $r>0$).

The results described below have their origin in the classical Lethargy Theorem by S.N. Bernstein [6], stating that, for any linear approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ in a Banach space $X$, if $\dim A_n < \infty$ for all $n$ and $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $E(x, A_n) = \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Bernstein's proof is based on a compactness argument, and this is the reason because he imposed $\dim A_n < \infty$ for all $n$. In 1964 H.S. Shapiro [23] used Baire's category theorem and Riesz's lemma (on the existence of almost orthogonal elements to any closed linear subspace $Y$ of a Banach space $X$) to prove that, for any sequence $A_1 \subsetneq A_2 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq X$ of closed (not necessarily finite dimensional) subspaces of a Banach space $X$, and any sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$, there exists an $x \in X$ such that $E(x, A_n) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$. This result was strengthened by Tjuriemskih [25], who, under the very same conditions of Shapiro's Theorem, proved the existence of $x \in X$ such that $E(x, A_n) \geq \varepsilon_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Moreover, Borodin [7] gave a new easy proof of this result and proved that, for arbitrary infinite dimensional Banach spaces $X$ and for sequences $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ satisfying $\varepsilon_n > \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $E(x, X_n) = \varepsilon_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$.

Motivated by these results, in [3] the authors gave several characterizations of the approximation schemes with the property that for every non-increasing sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists an element $x \in X$ such that $E(x, A_n) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$. In this case we say that $\{A_n\}$ *satisfies Shapiro's Theorem on* $X$. In particular, Shapiro's original theorem claims that all non-trivial linear approximation schemes $(X, \{A_n\})$ with $X$ a Banach space, satisfy a result of this kind.

Let us introduce still another definition: We say that the subset $Y$ of $X$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to the approximation scheme $(X, \{A_n\})$ if for every sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists an element $x \in Y$ such that $E(x, A_n) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$ (to simplify notation, and when no confusion is possible, we will just say that the approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $Y$).

Now, when studying these problems for general approximation schemes, the following results were proved (see [3, Theorem 2.2, Corollary 3.6], [4, Theorems 2.9, 4.2, 4.3 and 7.7]):

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $X$ be a quasi-Banach space. For any approximation scheme $(X, \{A_n\})$, the following are equivalent:*

- $(a)$ *The approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's Theorem on $X$.*
- $(b)$ *There exists a constant $c > 0$ and an infinite set $\mathbb{N}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists some $x_n \in X \setminus \overline{A_n}$ which satisfies $E(x_n, A_n) \leq cE(x_n, A_{K(n)})$.*
- $(c)$ *There is no decreasing sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ such that $E(x, A_n) \leq \varepsilon_n \|x\|$ for all $x \in X$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- $(d)$ *$E(S(0, 1), A_n) = 1$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.*
- $(e)$ *There exists $c > 0$ such that $E(S(0, 1), A_n) \geq c$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.*

*Moreover, if $X$ is a Banach space, then all these conditions are equivalent to:*

(*f*) *For every non-decreasing sequence* $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty} \searrow 0$ *there exists an element* $x \in X$ *such that* $E(x, A_n) \geq \varepsilon_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let* $X$ *be a quasi-Banach space and assume that* $(X, \{A_n\})$ *is an approximation scheme which satisfies Shapiro's theorem on* $X$. *If* $Y \subseteq X$ *is a finite codimensional subspace of* $X$, *then* $\{A_n\}$ *satisfies Shapiro's theorem on* $Y$. *If, furthermore,* $X$ *is Banach and* $Y$ *is closed in the topology of* $X$, *then for every sequence* $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ *there exists* $y \in Y$ *such that* $E(y, A_n)_X \geq \varepsilon_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let* $X$ *be a quasi-Banach space and assume that* $(X, \{A_n\})$ *is an approximation scheme such that* $A_n$ *is boundedly compact on* $X$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $Y \subseteq X$ *is an infinite dimensional closed subspace of* $X$, *then* $\{A_n\}$ *satisfies Shapiro's theorem on* $Y$.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let* $X$ *be a Banach space and assume that* $(X, \{A_n\})$ *is linear approximation scheme on* $X$ *such that* $\dim A_n < \infty$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *If* $Y \subseteq X$ *is an infinite dimensional closed subspace of* $X$, *then for every sequence* $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ *there exists* $y \in Y$ *such that* $\|y\| = \varepsilon_0$ *and* $E(y, A_n)_X \geq \varepsilon_n$ *for all* $n \geq 1$.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Suppose* $Y \subseteq X$ *is an infinite dimensional closed subspace of a Banach space* $X$, *and* $E = \{e_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ *is an unconditional basis of* $X$. *Set*

$$\Sigma_n(E) = \bigcup_{I \subseteq \mathbb{N}, \#(I)=n} \boldsymbol{span}\{e_i : i \in I\}, \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

*Then* $Y$ *satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to the approximation scheme* $\{\Sigma_n(E)\}$.

The main goal of this paper is to initiate a study about approximation schemes that satisfy Shapiro's theorem in the $F$-spaces setting. This question was studied, for the case of linear approximation schemes, by G. Albinus [1]. In this paper we characterize, for a large class of $F$-spaces $(X, d)$, the approximation schemes $\{A_n\}$ which satisfy Shapiro's theorem on $X$ and, as a consequence, we give a new proof of Albinus's theorem and we show a few more examples of approximation schemes satisfying Shapiro's theorem on $F$-spaces. Finally, we include some new applications of the lethargy results to the study of slow convergence of sequences of (possibly nonlinear) operators, a subject which has been recently investigated by Deutsch and Hundal for the case of continuous linear operators in the Banach setting [10, 11, 12].

## 2. SHAPIRO'S THEOREM FOR $F$-SPACES

Let us start with some general considerations about approximation schemes and the Shapiro's theorem. A first observation is that approximation schemes are only interesting in the infinite dimensional context:

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let* $(X, d)$ *be a metric vector space. If* $\dim(X) < \infty$ *and* $\{A_n\}$ *satisfies the conditions* $(A1)$, $(A2)$ *and* $(A3)$ *above, then there exists* $N \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $A_N = X$.

*Proof.* Let us set $X_n = \mathbf{span}(A_n)$, $n = 0, 1, \cdots$. Obviously, $X_n$ is a closed subspace of $X$ (since $s = \dim(X) < \infty$, which implies that all its subspaces are closed). Moreover, $\bigcup_n X_n$ is a dense subspace of $X$. Then Baire category theorem claims that there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_m$ has non-empty interior. Assume that $B(x, r) \subset X_m$. Then $B(-x, r) \subset X_m$ and

$$B(0, r) \subseteq \frac{1}{2}(B(x, r) + B(-x, r)) \subset X_m,$$

since $d$ is translation invariant, which implies that, if $d(z, 0) \leq r$ then $d(x + z, x) \leq r$, $d(-x + z, -x) \leq r$ and $z = \frac{1}{2}((x + z) + (-x + z))$. It follows that $X_m = X$ since the balls $B(0, r)$ are absorbing subsets of $X$. Now, $A_m$ spans $X_m$, so that we can take an algebraic basis of $X_m = X$ formed by elements of $A_m$. In particular, every $x \in X$ is a finite sum $\sum_{k=1}^{s} \lambda_k a_k$ of elements of $A_m$ (since $\lambda A_m \subseteq A_m$ for all scalar $\lambda$). On the other hand, $A_m + A_m + \cdots A_m$ ($s$ times) is a subset of $A_h(m)$, where $h(m) = K(K(\cdots K(m) \cdots)) = N \in \mathbb{N}$ is a fixed finite number. This ends the proof. □

In the normed and quasi-normed setting, two (quasi-)norms $\| \cdot \|_1$ and $\| \cdot \|_2$, defined over the same vector space $X$, are equivalent (i.e., define the same topology on $X$) if and only if there exists two constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $C_1 \|x\|_2 \leq \|x\|_1 \leq C_2 \|x\|_2$ for all $x \in X$. This has the nice consequence that an approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ in $X$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to the (quasi-) norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ if and only if it satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to any equivalent (quasi-)norm $\| \cdot \|_2$. In the case of $F$-spaces the question is much more delicate, since the equivalence of two distances $d_1$, $d_2$ is a much more subtle concept. Recall that metrics $d_1$ and $d_2$ over the vector space $X$ are equivalent if they generate the same topology on $X$.

**Definition 2.2** (Rolewicz, [21])**.** The metric $d$ is non-decreasing if $d(\alpha x, 0) \leq d(x, 0)$ whenever $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

**Remark 2.3.**

- $(i)$ If the metric $d$ is non decreasing, then $d(\alpha x, 0) \leq d(\beta x, 0)$ whenever $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta$ since, if $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$, then $0 \leq \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \leq 1$ and $d(\alpha x, 0) = d(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\beta x, 0) \leq d(\beta x, 0)$.
- $(ii)$ Assume that $d$ is non decreasing and $0 < \lambda \leq n$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $d(\lambda x, 0) = d(\frac{\lambda}{n} n x, 0) \leq d(nx, 0) \leq n d(x, 0)$ for all $x \in X$. Consequently, if $A \subset X$ satisfies $\alpha A \subset A$ for all scalar $\alpha$, then

$$E(\alpha x, A) \leq ([\alpha] + 1) E(x, A) \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ and } \alpha > 0.$$

(Here $[\alpha]$ denotes the integral part of $\alpha$).

- $(iii)$ If $(X, d)$ is a metric vector space, then $d^*(x, y) = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} d(tx, ty)$ defines a non-decreasing equivalent metric on $X$ ( see [21, Theorem 1.2.2.]).

**Example 2.4.** If $(X, d)$ is a locally convex metrizable topological vector space with metric $d(x, y) = \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{2^{-k} \frac{p_k(x-y)}{1+p_k(x-y)}\}$, where $\{p_k\}$ is a separating family of semi norms of $X$, then $\|x\|_X = d(x,0)$ satisfies

$$\min\{\alpha,1\}\|x\|_X \leq \|\alpha x\|_X \leq \max\{\alpha,1\}\|x\|_X \text{ for all } x\in X \text{ and } \alpha>0.$$

In particular, $d$ is non-decreasing. Furthermore, if $A\subset X$ satisfies $\lambda A\subset A$ for all scalar $\lambda$, then

$$\min\{\alpha,1\}E(x,A) \leq E(\alpha x,A) \leq \max\{\alpha,1\}E(x,A) \text{ for all } x\in X \text{ and } \alpha>0.$$

*Proof.* To prove this result it is enough to demonstrate that, if $t,\alpha\geq 0$, then

$$\min\{\alpha,1\}\frac{t}{1+t} \leq \frac{\alpha t}{1+\alpha t} \leq \max\{\alpha,1\}\frac{t}{1+t}. \tag{2.1}$$

These inequalities are trivial for $\alpha\in\{0,1\}$, so that we assume that $\alpha(1-\alpha)\neq 0$. Let us define the function $\phi_\alpha(t) = \frac{\alpha+\alpha t}{1+\alpha t} = \frac{\alpha t/(1+\alpha t)}{t/(1+t)}$. Obviously, $\phi'_\alpha(t) = \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{(1+\alpha t)^2}$, which is bigger than 0 if $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and smaller than 0 if $\alpha>1$. It follows that

$$\phi_\alpha(0)=\alpha\leq\phi_\alpha(t)\leq\lim_{t\to+\infty}\phi_\alpha(t)=1 \text{ whenever } \alpha\in(0,1)$$
$$\phi_\alpha(0)=\alpha\geq\phi_\alpha(t)\geq\lim_{t\to+\infty}\phi_\alpha(t)=1 \text{ whenever } \alpha>1$$

.

These inequalities can be rewritten as

$$\min\{\alpha,1\}\leq\phi_\alpha(t)\leq\max\{\alpha,1\}$$

or, in other words,

$$\min\{\alpha,1\}\frac{t}{1+t} \leq \frac{\alpha t}{1+\alpha t} \leq \max\{\alpha,1\}\frac{t}{1+t},$$

which is what we wanted to prove. □

**Example 2.5** (Musielak and Orlicz)**.** Let $X$ be a vector space with a metrizing modular $\rho(x)$, then $X_\rho=\{x\in X:\rho(x)<\infty\}$ is a vector space and

$$d_\rho(x,y)=\inf\{\varepsilon>0:\rho\left(\frac{x-y}{\varepsilon}\right)<\varepsilon\}$$

defines a non decreasing invariant by translations metric on $X_\rho$. Moreover, if $\|x\|_\rho = d_\rho(x,x)$, then $\{\|x_n\|_\rho\}\to 0$ if and only if $\rho(x_n)\to 0$ (See [21, page 6, Proposition 1.2.1. and Theorem 1.2.4.] for the definition of modulars and a proof of this result).

**Definition 2.6.** Let $\{A_n\}$ be an approximation scheme on the $F$-space $(X,d)$, and let $B\subseteq X$.

- (*a*) We say that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem on $B$ if there exists $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ such that, if $x\in B$ then $E(x,A_n)\leq C(x)\varepsilon_n$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and a certain constant $C(x)>0$.
- (*b*) We say that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on $B$ if there exists $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ such that, $E(x,A_n)\leq\varepsilon_n$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and all $x\in B$.
- (*c*) We say that $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $B$ if for every $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ there exists $x\in B$ such that $E(x,A_n)\neq\mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$.

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let $(X,d)$ be an $F$-space and assume that $d$ is non-decreasing. Let $\{A_n\}$ be an approximation scheme in $X$. Then the following are equivalent claims:*

- *(i) $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem in $X$.*
- *(ii) There exists $r_0>0$ such that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on the ball $B(0,r_0)$.*

*Consequently, the approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $X$ if and only if* $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} E(B(0,r),A_n)>0$ *for all $r>0$.*

For the proof of this result we need to use the following general property about sequences of positive real numbers:

**Lemma 2.8.** *Given $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ and $\{h(n)\}$ an increasing sequence of natural numbers satisfying $n\leq h(n)$ for all $n$, there exists a sequence $\{\xi_n\}\searrow 0$ such that $\varepsilon_n\leq\xi_n$ and $\xi_n\leq 2\xi_{h(n)}$ for all $n$.*

*Proof.* See [3, Lemma 2.3]. □

*Proof of Theorem 2.7.* $(i)\Rightarrow(ii)$. Assume that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem in $X$. Then there exists $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ such that, for every $x\in X$ there is a constant $C(x)>0$ such that $E(x,A_n)\leq C(x)\varepsilon_n$ for $n=0,1,\cdots$. It follows from Lemma 2.8 that we may assume, with no loss of generality, that $\varepsilon_n\leq 2\varepsilon_{K(n+1)-1}$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Obviously $X=\bigcup_n\Gamma_n$, where $\Gamma_\alpha=\{x\in X: E(x,A_n)\leq\alpha\varepsilon_n \text{ for all } n\in\mathbb{N}\}$. The sets $\Gamma_n$ are closed subsets of $X$, so that Baire's category theorem implies that $\Gamma_{m_0}$ contains an open ball $B(x_0,r_0)$ for a certain $m_0\in\mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, it is easy to check that the sets $\Gamma_\alpha$ satisfy the symmetry condition $\Gamma_\alpha=-\Gamma_\alpha$, so that $B(-x_0,r_0)\subseteq\Gamma_{m_0}$. Let $x,y\in\Gamma_{m_0}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\frac{x+y}{2},A_{K(n)}) &\leq E(\frac{x}{2},A_n)+E(\frac{y}{2},A_n) \text{ (since } A_n+A_n\subseteq A_{K(n)})\\
&\leq E(x,A_n)+E(y,A_n) \text{ (since } d \text{ is non-decreasing)}\\
&\leq 2m_0\varepsilon_n \ (n=0,1,\cdots)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now take $j\in\mathbb{N}$ be an (arbitrary) natural number. Then there exists a unique $n\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $K(n)\leq j\leq K(n+1)-1$. Hence

$$E(\frac{x+y}{2},A_j)\leq E(\frac{x+y}{2},A_{K(n)})\leq 2m_0\varepsilon_n\leq 2Cm_0\varepsilon_{K(n+1)-1}\leq 4m_0\varepsilon_j,$$

so that $\frac{x+y}{2}\in\Gamma_{4m_0}$. It follows that

$$B(0,r_0)\subseteq\frac{1}{2}(B(x_0,r_0)+B(-x_0,r_0))\subset\Gamma_{4m_0}.$$

Hence $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on $B(0,r_0)$.

$(ii)\Rightarrow(i)$. If $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on $B(0,r_0)$, then there exists $\{\varepsilon_n\}\searrow 0$ such that, $E(x,A_n)\leq\varepsilon_n$ for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and all $x\in B(0,r_0)$. On the other hand, the balls are absorbing subsets of $X$, so that, for any $x \in X$ there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $x \in \lambda B(0, r_0)$. Then $x = \lambda y$ for some $y \in B(0, r_0)$ and

$$E(x, A_n) = E(\lambda y, A_n) \leq ([\lambda] + 1)E(y, A_n) \leq ([\lambda] + 1)\varepsilon_n, \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

□

**Remark 2.9.** It follows easily from the proof of $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ in Theorem 2.7 that this implication holds true as soon as the metric $d$ satisfies $d(\frac{x}{2}, 0) \leq d(x, 0)$ for all $x \in X$. Analogously, the implication $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$ holds true as soon as $d$ satisfies $f(\lambda) = \sup_{x \neq 0} \frac{d(\lambda x, 0)}{d(x, 0)} < \infty$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

**Remark 2.10.** Theorem 2.7 generalizes Theorem 1.1 to $F$-spaces since, in the case of (quasi-) Banach spaces we have that $E(rx, A_n) = |r|^p E(x, A_n)$ (with $p = 1$ for the Banach setting), so that $E(S(X), A_n) = E(B(0, 1), A_n)$ and $E(B(0, r), A_n) = r^p E(B(0, 1), A_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $r > 0$. In particular, this implies that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(B(0, r), A_n) > 0$ for all $r > 0$ if and only if $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E(S(X), A_n) > 0$.

We use Theorem 2.7 to prove the following important result:

**Proposition 2.11.** *Let $d_1, d_2$ be two equivalent metrics over the same metric vector space $X$ and let us assume that $\{A_n\}$ is an approximation scheme on $X$. Then the following are equivalent claims:*

- *$(i)$ There exists $r_1 > 0$ such that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on the ball $B_{d_1}(0, r_1)$.*
- *$(ii)$ There exists $r_2 > 0$ such that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on the ball $B_{d_2}(0, r_2)$.*

*Consequently, if $d_1, d_2$ are both non decreasing equivalent metrics defining an $F$-space $X$, then $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to $d_1$ if and only if $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem with respect to $d_2$.*

**Remark 2.12.** An important result by Klee [17] (see also [21, Theorem 1.4.4.]) guarantees that, if $(X, d)$ is an $F$-space and $d'$ is a metric which is equivalent to $d$ and translation invariant, then $(X, d')$ is also an $F$-space (i.e., $X$ is complete with respect to $d'$). This may be not the case if the metric $d'$ is not translation invariant! Fortunately all metrics in this paper are assumed to be translation invariant.

*Proof of Proposition 2.11.* By definition, $d_1, d_2$ are equivalent metrics in $X$ if there exists functions $\varphi, \phi : (0, \infty) \to (0, \infty)$ such that

$$B_{d_2}(0, \varphi(r)) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, r)$$
$$B_{d_1}(0, \phi(r)) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, r)$$

for all $r > 0$. Take $\tau_0 = \varphi(1)$ and $0 < r < \tau_0$. Then

$$B_{d_2}(0, r) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, \tau_0) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, 1)$$

and there exists

$$\phi^*(r) := \inf\{s > 0 : B_{d_2}(0, r) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, s)\}.$$

In particular, $B_{d_2}(0, r) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, \phi^*(r))$. Analogously, for $r < \tau_1 = \phi(1)$ the function

$$\varphi^*(r) := \inf\{s > 0 : B_{d_1}(0, r) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, s)\}$$

is well defined and satisfies $B_{d_1}(0, r) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, \varphi^*(r))$.

Let us prove that $\lim_{r\to 0} \varphi^*(r) = 0$. Obviously, $\varphi^*$ is an increasing function, since $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ implies $B_{d_1}(0, \delta_1) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, \delta_2)$, so that $\lim_{r\to 0} \varphi^*(r) = \inf_{r>0} \varphi^*(r) = \rho \geq 0$. Assume that $\rho > 0$. Then

$$B_{d_1}(0, \phi(\frac{\rho}{2})) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, \frac{\rho}{2}),$$

and

$$\rho \leq \varphi^*(\phi(\frac{\rho}{2})) = \inf\{s : B_{d_1}(0, \phi(\frac{\rho}{2})) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, s)\} \leq \frac{\rho}{2},$$

which is impossible. It follows that $\lim_{r\to 0} \varphi^*(r) = 0$. Assume $(i)$. Let $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ and $r_1$ be such that

$$E_{d_1}(x, A_n) \leq \varepsilon_n \text{ for all } x \in B_{d_1}(0, r_1) \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $r_2 = \varphi(r_1) > 0$ and let $x \in B_{d_2}(0, r_2) \subseteq B_{d_1}(0, r_1)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $a_n \in A_n$ such that

$$d_1(x, a_n) = d_1(x - a_n, 0) \leq 2E_{d_1}(x, A_n) \leq 2\varepsilon_n.$$

In other words, we have that $x - a_n \in B_{d_1}(0, 2\varepsilon_n) \subseteq B_{d_2}(0, \varphi^*(2\varepsilon_n))$, so that $E_{d_2}(x, A_n) \leq \varphi^*(2\varepsilon_n)$. Now, the sequence $\{\varphi^*(2\varepsilon_n)\}$ is decreasing, converges to zero and does not depend on $x \in B_{d_2}(0, r_2)$. This ends the proof of $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$. The implication $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$ follows with the very same arguments.

The last part of this proposition follows as an easy corollary of the first part and Theorem 2.7. □

Theorem 2.7 characterizes approximation schemes satisfying Shapiro's theorem on (a large class of) $F$-spaces. Now, a natural question is to know if this characterization is useful for studying some concrete examples (otherwise, it would be a nice but inapplicable result). Fortunately, the theorem can be used for some classical cases. In particular, if we make some extra computations, which lead to a generalization of Riesz's lemma for the $F$-spaces setting that was proved by Albinus, we can characterize non-trivial linear approximation schemes satisfying Shapiro's theorem:

**Theorem 2.13** (Albinus). *Let $(X, d)$ be an $F$-space with non decreasing metric $d$ and let $\{A_n\}$ be a non trivial linear approximation scheme on $X$. Then $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $X$ if and only if* $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} E(X, A_n) > 0$.

**Lemma 2.14** (Albinus-Riesz Lemma)**.** *Let* $(X, d)$ *be a metric vector space,* $M$ *a vector subspace of* $X$*, and* $r > 0$*. Then*

$$E(B(0,r), M) = \min\{r, E(X, M)\}.$$

*Proof.* The inequality $E(B(0,r), M) \leq E(X, M)$ is obvious since $B(0,r) \subseteq X$. Moreover, $E(B(0,r), M) \leq r$ because $0 \in M$ implies that $E(x, M) \leq d(x, 0)$ for all $x$. This proves $E(B(0,r), M) \leq \min\{r, E(X, M)\}$. To prove the other inequality we only need to check that, if $E(B(0,r), M) < r$, then $E(B(0,r), M) = E(X, M)$ .

Let us assume that $E(B(0,r), M) < s < r$. If $B(0,s) + M \neq X$ there exists $x \in X$ such that $E(x, M) > s$. Define the function $\varphi(t) = E(tx, M)$. It is easy to prove that $\varphi$ is continuous and $\varphi(0) = 0$, $\varphi(1) > s$, so that there exists $\tau \in (0,1)$ such that $\varphi(\tau) = s$. What is more: we can take a sequence $\{\tau_n\} \subseteq [0,1]$ such that $\{\varphi(\tau_n)\}$ is increasing and converges to $s$ (this is so because $\phi(0) = 0 < s$). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $z_n = \tau_n x$. Then $E(z_n, M) < s$, which implies that there exists $m_n \in M$ such that $z_n = m_n + a_n$ with $d(a_n, 0) < s$. It follows that $E(a_n, M) = E(z_n, M) < s$ (since $M$ is a vector space) and $a_n \in B(0,s)$. Hence $E(z_n, M) \leq E(B(0,s), M) \leq E(B(0,r), M) < s < r$ for all $n$. On the other hand,

$$E(B(0,r), M) < s = \lim_{n\to\infty} E(z_n, M) \leq E(B(0,r), M),$$

which is impossible. This proves that $B(0,s) + M = X$, so that $E(X, M) \leq s$. Hence, if $E(B(0,r), M) < r$, then $E(B(0,r), M) = E(X, M)$, which is what we wanted to prove. □

*Proof of Albinus's theorem.* Theorem 2.7 guarantees that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem if and only if there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $\{E(B(0,r_0), A_n)\} \searrow 0$. On the other hand, Albinus-Riesz's lemma claims that $E(B(0,r_0), A_n) = \min\{r_0, E(X, A_n)\}$ for all $n$. Hence $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} E(X, A_n) = 0$. In other words, $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem if and only if $\inf_{n\in\mathbb{N}} E(X, A_n) > 0$. □

The following result shows a simple sufficient condition for an approximation scheme $\{A_n\}$ to satisfy Shapiro's theorem on $F$-spaces.

**Proposition 2.15.** *Let* $(X, d)$ *be an* $F$*-space with non decreasing metric* $d$ *and let* $\{A_n\}$ *be an approximation scheme on* $X$*. If there exist* $\mathbb{N}_0 \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *an infinite sequence of natural numbers,* $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ *a bounded subset of* $X$ *and* $c > 0$ *such that, for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *we have that*

$$c \leq E(x_n, A_n),$$

*then* $\{A_n\}$ *satisfies Shapiro's theorem on* $X$*.*

*Proof.* We proceed by contradiction. If we assume that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem on $X$, Theorem 2.7 guarantees that $\{A_n\}$ fails Shapiro's theorem uniformly on a ball $B(0,r)$ for a certain $r > 0$, since the metric $d$ is non decreasing. This means that there exist

$r > 0$ and $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ such that $E(x, A_n) \leq \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in B(0, r)$. Let us now assume that $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded subset of $X$, $c > 0$ and we have that $c \leq E(x_{n_k}, A_{n_k})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{k\to\infty} n_k = +\infty$. Take $\lambda > 0$ such that $\{x_{n_k}\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \subseteq \lambda B(0, r)$ and write $x_{n_k} = \lambda z_k$ with $z_k \in B(0, r)$. Then $E(z_k, A_n) \leq \varepsilon_n$ for al $n$. It follows that

$$c \leq E(x_{n_k}, A_{n_k}) = E(\lambda z_k, A_{n_k}) \leq ([\lambda] + 1)E(z_k, A_{n_k}) \leq ([\lambda] + 1)\varepsilon_{n_k} \quad (k = 0, 1, \cdots),$$

which is impossible, since $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$. □

**Corollary 2.16.** *Let $(X, d)$ be a locally convex metrizable topological vector space with metric $d(x, y) = \max_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\{2^{-k}\frac{p_k(x-y)}{1+p_k(x-y)}\}$, where $\{p_k\}$ is a separating family of semi norms of $X$. Assume that $(M_k) \subset [0, \infty)$, $\mathbb{N}_0$ is an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and there exist $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \subseteq X$, $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$ such that:*

*(a) $p_k(x_n) \leq M_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

*(b) $E_{m_0}(x_n, A_n) := \inf_{a\in A_n} p_{m_0}(x_n - a) > \delta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

*Then $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $X$.*

*Proof.* Condition $(a)$ guarantees that $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a bounded subset of $X$. On the other hand, $\xi(t) = t/(1 + t)$ is an increasing function on $(0, \infty)$, which implies that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\nvdash}$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < c &= 2^{-m_0}\frac{\delta}{1+\delta} < 2^{-m_0}\frac{E_{m_0}(x_n, A_n)}{1 + E_{m_0}(x_n, A_n)} \\ &\leq \max_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\{2^{-m}\frac{E_m(x_n, A_n)}{1 + E_m(x_n, A_n)}\} \\ &= \max_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\{\inf_{a\in A_n} 2^{-m}\frac{p_m(x_n - a)}{1 + p_m(x_n - a)}\} \\ &\leq \inf_{a\in A_n}\{\max_{m\in\mathbb{N}} 2^{-m}\frac{p_m(x_n - a)}{1 + p_m(x_n - a)}\} \\ &= E(x_n, A_n) \end{aligned}$$

and we can use Proposition 2.15. □

## 3. Slow convergence of sequences of operators

**Definition 3.1.** Let $(X, \rho)$ and $(Y, d)$ be two $F$- spaces. Let $T : X \to Y$ be a (possibly nonlinear) operator and $T_n : X \to Y$ be a sequence of (possibly nonlinear) operators. We say that $T_n$ converges almost arbitrarily slowly to $T$ if

$(i)$ $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(T_n x, T x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$.

$(ii)$ For every $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists $x \in X$ such that $d(T_n x, T x) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$.

We say that $T_n$ converges arbitrarily slowly to $T$ if it satisfies $(i)$ above and

$(iii)$ For every $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists $x \in X$ such that $d(T_n x, T x) \geq \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $Z \subset X$, we say that $T_n$ converges almost arbitrarily slowly to $T$ relative to $Z$ if it satisfies $(i)$ above and (*iv*) For every $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists $x \in Z$ such that $d(T_n x, Tx) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$.

We say that $T_n$ converges arbitrarily slowly to $T$ relative to $Z$ if it satisfies (*i*) above and

(*v*) For every $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ there exists $x \in Z$ such that $d(T_n x, Tx) \geq \varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$..

The study of slow convergence of sequences of operators was quite recently initiated by Deutsch and Hundal [10, 11, 12]. Concretely, in [10] they introduced the concepts of arbitrarily slowly (respectively, almost arbitrarily slowly) convergence of a sequence of linear operators $T_n$ to an operator $T$, and characterized almost arbitrarily slowly convergent sequences as those which are punctually convergent but not norm convergent. This result can be generalized to the $F$-spaces setting as follows:

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let $(X, \rho)$ be an $F$-space and $(Y, d)$ be a metric vector space with non decreasing metric $d$. Let $T : X \to Y$ be a continuous linear operator and $T_n : X \to Y$ be a sequence of continuous linear operators. The following are equivalent claims:*

(*i*) *The sequence $\{T_n\}$ converges punctually to $T$ but it does not converge almost arbitrarily slowly to $T$.*

(*ii*) *There exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ and a positive real number $r_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(T_n - T)(B_\rho(0, r_0)) \subseteq B_d(0, \varepsilon_n), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots .$$

*In particular, if (i) holds true, $\{T_n\}$ converges to $T$ in the topology of bounded convergence. Finally, if $X$ is locally bounded, (i) and (ii) are equivalent to*

(*iii*) *$\{T_n\}$ converges to $T$ in the topology of bounded convergence.*

*Proof.* (*i*) $\Rightarrow$ (*ii*). Assume (*i*). Then for each $x \in X$ there exists $\{\varepsilon_n\} \searrow 0$ and $C(x) > 0$ such that $d(T_n x, Tx) \leq C(x)\varepsilon_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $X = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta_m$, where

$$\Delta_m = \{x \in X : d(T_n x, Tx) \leq m\varepsilon_n \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Obviously, $\Delta_m$ is a closed subset of $X$ since $T, T_n$ are continuous. Furthermore, $\Delta_m = -\Delta_m$ and, if $x, y \in \Delta_m$ then

$$\begin{aligned} d(T_n(\frac{x+y}{2}), T(\frac{x+y}{2}) &= d(\frac{1}{2}(T_n - T)(x+y), 0) \leq d((T_n - T)(x+y), 0) \\ &\leq d((T_n - T)(x), 0) + d((T_n - T)(y), 0) \leq 2m\varepsilon_n, \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}), \end{aligned}$$

since $d$ is non decreasing. This implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\Delta_m + \Delta_m) \subseteq \Delta_{2m}. \tag{3.1}$$

Baire's category theorem implies that $B_\rho(x_0, r_0) \subseteq \Delta_{m_0}$ for certain $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0 \in X$ and $r_0 > 0$. Furthermore, $B_\rho(-x_0, r_0) \subseteq \Delta_{m_0}$, since $\Delta_{m_0} = -\Delta_{m_0}$ and the inclusion (3.1) shows that

$$B_\rho(0, r_0) \subseteq \frac{1}{2}(B_\rho(x_0, r_0) + B_\rho(-x_0, r_0)) \subseteq \Delta_{2m_0}.$$

This proves (*i*) $\Rightarrow$ (*ii*).

$(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. Assume $(ii)$ and let $x \in X$. There exists $\lambda > 0$ such that $x = \lambda y$ with $y \in B_\rho(0.r_0)$, since these balls are absorbing sets. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(T_n x, Tx) &= d((T_n - T)x, 0) = d(\lambda(T_n - T)y, 0) \\ &\leq ([\lambda] + 1)d((T_n - T)y, 0) \leq ([\lambda] + 1)\varepsilon_n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}), \end{aligned}$$

which proves $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. The last part of this theorem follows easily from the equivalence $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)$ above, in conjunction with the definition of the topology of bounded convergence on the space of linear continuous operators $B(X, Y)$ and the fact that balls are bounded sets in locally bounded metric spaces. □

Theorem 3.2 has the following nice consequence:

**Corollary 3.3.** *Let $(X, \rho)$ be a locally bounded $F$-space and $(Y, d)$ be a metric vector space with non decreasing metric $d$. Let $T : X \to Y$ be a continuous linear operator and $T_n : X \to Y$ be a sequence of continuous linear operators. The following are equivalent claims:*

- $(i)$ *The sequence $\{T_n\}$ converges almost arbitrarily slowly to $T$.*
- $(ii)$ *$\{T_n\}$ converges punctually to $T$ but it does not converge to $T$ in the topology of bounded convergence.*

In [10] the authors proved that some classical families of operators are almost arbitrarily slowly convergent to the identity and they stated (with no proof) that Bernstein's operators are in fact arbitrarily slowly convergent to the identity. They conjectured that this property should also hold true for other classical operators such as Féjer's or Landau's. They solved their conjecture in the positive in [12] by using a small modification of Tjuriemskih's lethargy theorem [25]. These results have been our main motivation to demonstrate Theorem 3.4 below, which generalizes the ideas of [12] to a much more general context.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let $(X, \rho)$ and $(Y, d)$ be two $F$- spaces. Let $\{A_n\}$ be an approximation scheme on $Y$ and let us assume that $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $Y$. Let $T : X \to Y$ be an operator and and $T_n : X \to Y$ be a sequence of operators such that*

- $(i)$ $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(T_n x, Tx) = 0$ *for all $x \in X$.*
- $(ii)$ $T_n(X) \subseteq A_n$ *for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Then:*

- $(a)$ *If $T(X) = Y$ then $T_n \to T$ almost arbitrarily slowly. Furthermore, if $T(X) = Y$ and $Y$ is a Banach space, then $T_n \to T$ arbitrarily slowly.*
- $(b)$ *If $Z$ is a subspace of $Y$ such that $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $Z$ and $Z \subseteq T(X)$, then $T_n \to T$ almost arbitrarily slowly. Moreover, if we add the*

*hypothesis that* $X = Y$ *and* $T = I$*, then* $T_n \to I$ *almost arbitrarily slowly relative to* $Z$*.*

($c$) *Assume that* $X$, $Y$ *are quasi-Banach,* $A_n$ *is a vector space and* $\dim A_n < \infty$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*, and there exists* $Z$*, a closed subspace of* $Y$*, such that* $Z \subseteq T(X)$ *and* $\dim Z = \infty$*. Then* $T_n \to T$ *arbitrarily slowly. Moreover, if we add the hypothesis that* $X = Y$ *and* $T = I$*, then* $T_n \to I$ *arbitrarily slowly relative to* $Z$*.*

*Proof.* ($a$). Let $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ be a non-increasing sequence converging to 0. We know that $E(y, A_n) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$ for a certain $y \in Y$, since $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $Y$. Now, $T(X) = Y$ implies that $y = Tx$ for a certain $x \in X$. This leads to

$$d(T_n x, Tx) \neq \mathbf{O}(\varepsilon_n)$$

(which is what we wanted to prove), since $T(X) \subseteq A_n$ implies that $d(T_n x, Tx) \geq E(Tx, A_n) = E(y, A_n)$. The second part of ($a$) follows directly from Corollary 3.7 in [3].

($b$) The arguments are the same as in ($a$), but now we use that $\{A_n\}$ satisfies Shapiro's theorem on $Z$ and $Z \subseteq T(X)$. Thus, the element $y$ can be chosen from $Z$ and it is still of the form $y = Tx$ for a certain $x \in X$. This leads to almost arbitrarily slowly convergence of $T_n$ to the operator $T$.

($c$) Use Theorem 4.3 from [4]. □

Theorem 3.4 includes some interesting situations not considered in [12]. We include a few of them here for the sake of completeness:

- Greedy approximation with respect to a complete minimal system in the Banach setting produces sequences of nonlinear operators $T_n$ which are arbitrarily slowly convergent to the identity operator (see [3, Theorem 6.2]).
- Greedy approximation with respect to an unconditional basis $(\phi_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of a separable Banach space $X$ produces sequences of nonlinear operators $T_n$ which are almost arbitrarily slowly convergent to the identity operator relative to any infinite dimensional closed subspace $Z$ of $X$ (see [4, Theorem 7.7]).
- If $T_n : X \to Y$ is a sequence of linear operators, $T_n \to T$ punctually, $T(X)$ contains a finite codimensional subspace of $Y$, and $\overline{T_n(X)} \neq Y$ for all $n$, then $T_n \to T$ almost arbitrarily slowly (Use Theorem 2.9 from [4] and part ($b$) of Theorem 3.4).
- Consider the examples given in [12] (Bernstein's, Fejer's, etc.). In all these cases we can prove that the sequence of operators is arbitrarily slowly convergent to the identity operator relative to any infinite dimensional closed subspace $Z$ of $C[a, b]$. (To prove this, just take into account part ($c$) of Theorem 3.4).

The operators $T$ to which Theorem 3.4 is applicable have large range. In fact, they satisfy $T(X) = Y$ (the whole image space) or $T(X)$ contains a finite-codimensional subspace of $Y$, or it contains an infinite dimensional closed subspace of $Y$ (e.g., this holds true if $\dim T(X) = \infty$ and $T$ has closed range. These operators are well known in functional analysis). This is obviously a serious restriction on our theory. For example, if the inclusion of the infinite-dimensional closed subspace $Z \subset T(X)$ is continuous, then $T$ will be not compact. An interesting open question is to look for some kind of description of the class of compact operators $T$ such that $T_n$ converges almost arbitrarily slowly to $T$ if and only if it converges arbitrarily slowly to $T$. What is more, perhaps this question makes sense for other important classes of operators such as strictly singular, finitely strictly singular, etc.

## References

[1] **G. Albinus,** Eine bemerkung zur approximationstheorie in metrisierbaren topologischen vectorräumen, Rev. Roum. Math. Pures et Appl. **14** (10) (1969) 1383-1894.

[2] **J. M. Almira,** On strict inclusion relations between approximation and interpolation spaces, Banach J. Math. Anal. **5** (2) (2011) 93-105

[3] **J. M. Almira, T. Oikhberg,** Approximation schemes satisfying Shapiro's theorem, J. Approx. Theory **164** (2012) 534-571.

[4] **J. M. Almira, T. Oikhberg,** Shapiro's theorem for subspaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **388** (2012) 282-302.

[5] **T. Aoki,** Locally bounded linear topological spaces, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo **18** (10) (1942) 588-594.

[6] **S. N. Bernstein,** Sur le probleme inverse de la théorie de la meilleure approximation des functions continues. Comtes Rendus, **206** (1938) 1520-1523.(See also: Ob obratnoi zadache teorii nailuchshego priblizheniya nepreryvnykh funksii, Sochineniya Vol II (1938)

[7] **P. A. Borodin,** On the existence of an element with given deviations from an expanding system of subspaces, Mathematical Notes, 80 (5) (2006) 621-630 (Translated from Matematicheskie Zameti 80 (5) (2006) 657-667).

[8] **Y. Brudnyi, N. Kruglyak,** On a family of approximation spaces, In: *Investigations in function theory of several real variables* Yaroslavl' State Univ., Yaroslavl' (1978),15-42.

[9] **P.L. Butzer and K. Scherer,** *Approximationsprozesse und Interpolationsmethoden*, Bibliographisches Institut Mannheim, Mannheim, 1968.

[10] **F. Deutsch, H. Hundal,** Slow convergence of sequences of linear operators I: Almost arbitrarily slow convergence, J. Approx. Theory **162** (2010) 1701-1716.

[11] **F. Deutsch, H. Hundal,** Slow convergence of sequences of linear operators II: Arbitrarily slow convergence, J. Approx. Theory **162** (2010) 1717-1738.

[12] **F. Deutsch, H. Hundal,** Some applications of Tyuriemskih's lethargy theorem, to appear in Numer. Functional Anal. and Optimization, 2012.

[13] **R. A. DeVore,** Nonlinear approximation, Acta Numer. **7** (1998) 51-150.

[14] **R. A. DeVore, G. G. Lorentz,** *Constructive approximation,* Springer, 1993.

[15] **S. Kakutani,** Über die Metrisation der topologischen Gruppen, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo, **12** (1936) 82-84.

[16] **N. J. Kalton, N. T. Peck, J. W. Roberts,** *An F-space sampler,* London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series **89**, Cambridge University Press, 1984.

[17] **V. Klee,** Invariant metrics in groups, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Math Scand. **3** (1952) 484-487.

[18] **A. N. Kolmogorov,** Zur Normierbarkeit eines allgemeinen topologischen Raumes, Studio Matt. **5** (1935) 29-33.

[19] **A. Pietsch,** Approximation spaces, Journal of Approximation Theory **32** (1981) 115–134.

[20] **A. Pietsch,** *Operator ideals*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1980.

[21] **S. Rolewicz,** *Metric linear spaces, 2th Ed.* Mathematics and its applications, East European Series, Kluwer Acad. Publ., 1985.

[22] **S. Rolewicz,** On a certain class of linear metric spaces, Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. **5** (1957) 471-473.

[23] **H. S. Shapiro,** Some negative theorems of Approximation Theory, Michigan Math. J. **11** (1964) 211–217.

[24] **I. Singer,** *Best approximation in normed linear spaces by elements of linear subspaces*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1970.
[25] **I. S. Tjuriemskih,** On a problem of S. N. Bernstein, Uchen. Zap. Kalinin. Gos. Ped. Inst. **52** (1967) 123–129 (Russian).

J. M. Almira
Departamento de Matemáticas. Universidad de Jaén.
E.P.S. Linares, C/Alfonso X el Sabio, 28
23700 Linares (Jaén) Spain
email: jmalmira@ujaen.es